



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,443	03/19/2004	Pankaj Bishnoi	016295.1586	7293
23640	7590	03/03/2009		
BAKER BOTTS, LLP 910 LOUISIANA HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995			EXAMINER FRANKLIN, RICHARD B	
			ART UNIT 2181	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/03/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

debbie.allen@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,443

Applicant(s)

BISHNOI ET AL.

Examiner

RICHARD FRANKLIN

Art Unit

2181

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-11, 19, 20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/19/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 24 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.63.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement(s) has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609.

Drawings

4. The drawing(s) have been reviewed by the examiner and are found comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.81 to 1.85.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 9, 11, 19 – 20, and 23 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,003,563 (hereinafter Leigh).

As per claim 1, Leigh teaches an information handling system (Figure 5 Item 82), comprising a first port operable to receive first analog video signals (Figure 5 [Port on Item 82 connected to cable 100]); embedded control logic (Figure 5 Items 84 and 94) operably coupled to the first port, the embedded control logic operable to select either the first analog video signals received by the first port or second analog video signals generated by the information handling system (Col 7 Lines 23 – 31); and a second port operably coupled to the embedded control logic (Figure 5 [Port on Item 82 connected to cable 92]), the second port operable to transmit at least one of the first and second analog video signals to a master controller operably coupled to the information handling system (Col 5 Lines 50 – 53 and Col 6 Lines 35 – 39).

As per claim 2, Leigh also teaches wherein the embedded control logic comprises a multiplexer (Figure 5 Item 94) including a first input interfaced with the first

port (Figure 5 [Port on Item 94 connected to cable 100]); a second input interfaced with a video source in the information handling system (Figure 5 [Port on Item 94 connected to connection 95]); and an output interfaced with the second port (Figure 5 [Port on Item 94 connected to cable 92]); the multiplexer operable to transmit the first analog video signals received by the first port and the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system to the second port (Col 5 Lines 50 – 53 and Col 6 Lines 35 – 39); and a processing resource interfaced with the multiplexer and the first and second ports (Figure 5 Item 84), the processing resource operable to generate a mux signal for selecting the first and second analog video signals (Figure 5 Item 99).

As per claim 3, Leigh also teaches the mux signal generated based on a selection signal received from a shared bus through at least one of the first and second ports on a shared bus, the selection signal generated by the master controller (Col 6 Lines 21 – 26).

As per claims 4 and 20, Leigh also teaches wherein the embedded control logic operable to obtain operating information associated with the information handling system (Col 5 Lines 50 – 53).

As per claim 5, Leigh also teaches wherein the operating information is system performance parameters (Col 9 Lines 3 – 6).

As per claim 8, Leigh also teaches wherein the first and second ports operable to receive backup power for operating the embedded control logic (Col 9 Lines 26 – 30).

As per claim 9, Leigh also teaches a first twisted pair cable operably coupled to the first port (Figure 2 Items 46, 48, and 50, Col 4 Lines 28 – 31); and a second twisted pair cable operably coupled to the second port (Figure 2 Items 46, 48, and 50, Col 4 Lines 28 – 31); the first and second twisted pair cables operable to transmit the first and second analog video signals (Col 4 Lines 28 – 31).

As per claim 11, Leigh also teaches wherein the master controller receives the first and second analog signals and converts the first and second analog video signals to digital video signals for transmission over an Ethernet (Col 5 Lines 56 – 61).

As per claim 19, Leigh teaches a method for managing multiple information handling systems (Figure 5 Item 82) using embedded control logic, comprising: receiving first analog video signals from a first port (Figure 5 [Port on Item 82 connected to cable 100]); generating second analog video signals by an information handling system (Col 7 Lines 23 – 31); selecting either the first analog video signals received from the first port or the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system based on a selection signal received from a master controller operably coupled to the information handling system (Col 7 Lines 23 – 31); and transmitting the

selected analog video signals through a second port to the master controller (Col 5 Lines 50 – 53 and Col 6 Lines 35 – 39).

As per claim 23, Leigh also teaches the selection signal received from at least one of the first and second ports on a shared bus (Col 6 Lines 20 – 29).

As per claim 24, Leigh also teaches at least one of a keyboard signal and a mouse signal received from at least one of the first and second ports on a shared bus (Col 5 Line 62 – Col 6 Line 11)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,003,563 (hereinafter Leigh) in view of US Patent No. 6,408,334 (hereinafter Bassman).

As per claims 7 and 22, Leigh teaches the system and method as described per claims 1 and 19 (see rejection of claims 1 and 19 above).

Leigh does not explicitly teach wherein the embedded control logic includes a backup power source operable to power the embedded control logic if the information handling system is powered off.

However, Bassman teaches a backup battery which powers the embedded control logic when the information handling system is powered off (Bassman; Col 5 Lines 61 – 64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Leigh to include the backup power because doing so allows the information handling system to provide data in the event of a power failure (Bassman; Col 5 Lines 61 – 64).

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 7,003,563 (hereinafter Leigh) in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0131127 (hereinafter King).

As per claim 10, Leigh teaches the system and method as described per claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above).

Leigh does not explicitly teach wherein the first and second analog video signals comprise RGB signals.

However, King teaches wherein the analog video signals comprise RGB signals (King; Paragraph [0038])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Leigh to include the

RGB signals because doing so allows the computer to distribute the video signal (King; Paragraphs [0035] – [0041]).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 6 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest alone or in combination ***the second port operable to receive third analog video signals; the first port operable to transmit the second and third analog video signals; and the embedded control logic operable to selectively transmit either the first analog video signals received by the first port and the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system over the second port or the third analog video signals received by the second port and the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system over the first port***, as required by dependent claim 6, ***in combination with the other recited claim limitations*** (emphasis added). The prior art of record teaches an information processing system receiving a first video signal from a first port and transmitting through a second port either the first video or a second video signal

generated within the information processing system (see rejection above). However, the prior art of record does not teach receiving first and third video signal from either one of the first and second port respectively, and deciding to either transmit the received video signal or the second video signal through the either one of the first and second ports respectively, as required by dependent claim 6. The prior art of record also fails to teach the "ring" or "loop" topology necessary to support the video signal routing described above.

Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest alone or in combination ***receiving third analog video signals from the second port; selecting the first analog video signals received from the first port or the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system for transmission over the second port; selecting the third analog video signals received from the second port or the second analog video signals generated by the information handling system for transmission over the first port; and transmitting the selected analog video signals through at least one of the first and second ports***, as required by dependent claim 21, ***in combination with the other recited claim limitations*** (emphasis added). The prior art of record teaches an information processing system receiving a first video signal from a first port and transmitting through a second port either the first video or a second video signal generated within the information processing system (see rejection above). However,

the prior art of record does not teach receiving first and third video signal from either one of the first and second port respectively, and deciding to either transmit the received video signal or the second video signal through the either one of the first and second ports respectively, as required by dependent claim 21. The prior art of record also fails to teach the "ring" or "loop" topology necessary to support the video signal routing described above.

10. Claims 12 – 18 are allowed.

11. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claim 12 is allowed because the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest alone or in combination ***embedded control logic operably coupled between the first port and the second port, the embedded control logic operable to selectively transmit to a master controller operably coupled to the information handling system either the first video signals received from the first port or third video signals generated by the information handling system through the second port or the second video signals received from the second port or the third video signals generated by the information handling system through the first port***, as required by independent claim 12, ***in combination with the other recited claim limitations*** (emphasis added). The prior art of record teaches an information processing system receiving a first video signal from a first port and transmitting through a second port either the first video or a second video signal generated within the information processing system (see rejection above). However, the prior art of record does not teach receiving first and third video

signal from either one of the first and second port respectively, and deciding to either transmit the received video signal or the second video signal through the either one of the first and second ports respectively, as required by dependent claim 12. The prior art of record also fails to teach the "ring" or "loop" topology necessary to support the video signal routing described above.

Claims 13 – 18 are also allowed because of their dependency upon allowable claim 12.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RICHARD FRANKLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-0669. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alford Kindred can be reached on (571) 272-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Richard Franklin
/RBF/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2181

/Alford W. Kindred/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2181